

PACS number: 03.65.Bz

Quantum non-demolition (QND) modulation of quantum interference

M.Genovese *, C.Novero

Istituto Elettrotecnico Nazionale Galileo Ferraris

Str. delle Cacce 91

I-10135 Torino, Italy

Abstract

We propose an experiment where quantum interference between two different paths is modulated by means of a QND measurement on one or both the arms of an interferometer. The QND measurement is achieved in a Kerr cell. We illustrate a scheme for the realisation of this experiment and discuss some further developments.

* genovese@ien.it

In studying the foundations of quantum mechanics, in recent years, considerable interest has been devoted to the investigation of quantum interference and to its disappearance when *welcher Weg* (which path) information is obtained. An interesting example of quantum interference and of its non-intuitive properties is provided by the possibility of erasing (even after the measurement of the quantum system) the *welcher Weg* information re-obtaining the interference: the so called quantum eraser (of which many different versions have been proposed [1,2] and realised [3,4]). These recent studies on quantum interference have highlighted how the interference is wiped out not by momentum kinks or due to the uncertainty principle, but by destroying the entanglement related to the possibility of obtaining the *welcher Weg* information [5,6].

The great interest in understanding these fundamental aspects of quantum mechanics justifies the proposal and realisation of new experiments which permit a deeper study of these phenomena.

Another extremely interesting field of investigation in the foundation of quantum mechanics concerns the possibility of performing measurements without disturbing the measured system by introducing uncontrollable quantum fluctuations: so called Quantum Non-Demolition (QND) measurements [8,9].

QND measurements can also be used to obtain *welcher Weg* information. One can show that in this case, the fact of having obtained a *welcher Weg* information leads to the destruction of quantum interference [6].

In this letter we study the effect of a QND measurement on quantum interference and in particular the effect of erasure of the *welcher Weg* information obtained by this measurement. We believe that the implementation of this experiment will provide a very clear and interesting example of the effect on a quantum system of a *Welcher Weg* measurement and of its partial or total erasure.

Let us consider the set-up of fig.1, a "signal" photon enters the Beam-Splitter I (BS I) from port 1; assuming for simplicity a 50% BS (the treatment of the non 50% case is a trivial extension) we will have after the BS

$$a_2 = \frac{a_1 + ia_0}{\sqrt{2}} \quad a_3 = \frac{a_0 + ia_1}{\sqrt{2}} \quad (1)$$

Furthermore, a probe laser crosses the Kerr cell on the third arm acquiring a phase which in principle will be measurable with homodyne detection providing *welcher Weg* information.

Assuming [6] an interaction Hamiltonian of the form:

$$H = \omega_s n_s + \omega_p n_p + \frac{\chi_s}{2} n_s^2 + \frac{\chi_p}{2} n_p^2 + 2\chi n_s n_p \quad (2)$$

(where n_s and n_p are the photon number operators for the signal and probe fields respectively, ω_s and ω_p their respective frequencies and χ_s , χ_p and χ the non-linear coefficients), one can see that the photon number remains unchanged, whilst the phases change in both the signal and the probe fields. In more detail, (using the simplifying hypothesis of having chosen an interaction time T such that $\chi_p n_p T = 2\pi N$ where N is an integer) one finds

$$\exp [-i (\omega_p + \chi_p/2 + 2\chi n_s) T] \quad (3)$$

for the probe laser phase and

$$\exp [-i (\omega_s + \chi_s/2 + \chi_s n_3 + 2\chi n_p) T] \quad (4)$$

for the 3rd arm signal field (here and in the following $n_i = a_i^\dagger a_i$).

After recombination on Beam Splitter II (BS II) we have:

$$a_4 = \frac{a_2 + ia_3 \exp [-i [(\omega_s + \chi_s/2 + \chi_s n_3 + 2\chi n_p) T + \Theta]]}{\sqrt{2}} \quad (5)$$

where the phase Θ takes into account different lengths of arms 2 and 3 and could be varied interposing a variable phase shift on one of the interferometer arms.

If we assume, as a simplifying approximation, that the probe laser is described by a coherent field $|\nu\rangle$, the initial state is $= |1\rangle_1|0\rangle_0|\nu\rangle_p$, and

$$\langle\Psi|n_4|\Psi\rangle = 1/2[1 - \exp[-2|\nu|^2\sin^2(\chi T)]\cos[(\omega_s + \chi_s)T + \Theta + |\nu|^2\sin(2\chi T)]] \quad (6)$$

To this point, the usual treatment [6] of QND ideal *welcher Weg* experiment has been considered, with the well known result that the probe laser acquires a phase which permits the identification of the path followed by the signal photon by a homodyne detection. As the signal-to-noise ratio in the homodyne measurement is $R = 4|\nu|\sin(\chi T)$ [6], one finds a suppression of interference, whose visibility is related to R and given by $\exp(-R^2/8)$. It is, therefore, evident that increasing the signal-to-noise ratio R , i.e. a better determination of the probe laser phase, directly relates to the disappearance of interference fringes for the signal field. Also in this case, we find that the disappearance of interference is clearly due to the acquisition of *welcher Weg* information and not to disturbances introduced into the system by the measurement.

A quantitative definition of *distinguishability* D of the ways is given in Ref. [7], where it is also shown how D and the fringe visibility V satisfy the inequality

$$D^2 + V^2 \leq 1 \quad (7)$$

According to the discussion given in Ref. [7], when the initial "detector" state can be described by a statistical operator corresponding to a pure state and thus, in particular, by $|\nu\rangle\langle\nu|$, the equal sign holds in Eq. 7.

Let us now consider the insertion of a second Kerr cell on the 2^{nd} arm (KII in fig.1) and let us assume that the interaction time between the probe and signal fields in this cell is T' .

We now have:

$$a_4 = \frac{a_2 \exp[-i[(\omega_s + \chi_s/2 + \chi_s n_2 + 2\chi n_p)T']] + ia_3 \exp[-i[(\omega_s + \chi_s/2 + \chi_s n_3 + 2\chi n_p)T + \Theta]]}{\sqrt{2}} \quad (8)$$

If the distance between the two Kerr cells is less than the coherence length of the probe field, the two paths will become indistinguishable again ($D \rightarrow 0$) and interference will be achieved once more ($V \rightarrow 1$). Setting

$$\beta = (\omega_s + \chi_s/2 + \chi_s n_s + 2\chi n_p), \quad (9)$$

one has

$$\langle \Psi | n_4 | \Psi \rangle = 1/4 \langle \Psi | n_1 [2 - (\exp[-i(\Theta + \beta(T - T'))] + \exp[i(\Theta + \beta(T - T')])] | \Psi \rangle \quad (10)$$

If we choose the Kerr cells so that $T = T'$, the phase into the probe due to the photon in path 3 or 2 would be the same and the interference pattern $\frac{1 - \cos(\Theta)}{2}$ is recovered for the signal field.

On the other hand, if one considers the case where the distance between the two Kerr cells is larger than the coherence length of the probe laser (e.g. 0.1 m for a single line argon laser) the two paths will still be distinguishable (in general a random phase will appear between arm 2 and 3) and interference will be lost. For example, this scheme could be realised taking a much shorter path between BS I and Kerr Cell I than between BS II and Kerr II and then compensating this difference after the Kerr cells, so as to have arm 2 and 3 equivalent.

This effect can be regulated, increasing the coherence length of the laser. In this way the interference pattern would thus be modulated by changing the coherence length of the laser before injecting it into the first Kerr cell. The observation of this effect represents,

according to our opinion, a very good and illustrative example of the effect of disappearance of quantum interference when *welcher Weg* information is obtained and of the effect of erasing this information. Furthermore, one can also think of erasing the quantum information after the two Kerr cell (if decoherence effect are sufficiently tamed) realising a "true" quantum eraser, where also the delayed choice request is implemented. Of course, single photons are necessary for the implementation of the experiment, on the other hand the interference pattern will be reconstructed on a whole ensemble of photons. Incidentally, it must be acknowledged that, recently, an optical realisation of a delayed choice quantum eraser, based on type II parametric down conversion, has been realised [10].

Let us now investigate the possibility of a practical realisation of this scheme.

Although admittedly very difficult, the QND detection of a single photon is at present possible [11,6]. QND measurements of *welcher Weg* have already been achieved using 100 meter long optical fibers (see Imoto et al. and Levenson et al. [9]). Of course, the implementation of the present scheme using such devices would be, even though not impossible in theory, almost impossible in practice. The recent discovery of new materials with very high Kerr coupling, could however permit an easier and more realistic, implementation of this experiment.

Two candidates as Kerr cell with ultra-high susceptibility to be used for this scheme are the Quantum Coherent Atomic Systems (QCAS) [12,11] and the Bose-Einstein condensate of ultracold (at nanoKelvin temperatures) atomic gas [13]. These are recent great technical improvements which could permit the realisation of small Kerr cells, capable of large phase shift, even with a low-intensity probe. In fact, both exhibit extremely high Kerr couplings compared to more traditional materials. In particular, the QCAS is a rather simple system to be realised (for a review see [14]) and thus represents an ideal candidate to this role. Incidentally, one can notice that Kerr coupling can be further enhanced by enclosing the medium in a cavity [15].

In the following we will consider how we could set up this experiment using the QCAS as Kerr cell.

Defining the Kerr coupling χ^3 through

$$P_i(\omega) = 3\epsilon_0 \Sigma_{j,k,l} \chi_{i,j,k,l}^3 E_j(\omega) E_k(\omega) E_l^*(\omega) \quad (11)$$

where P_i is the third order polarisation and E_i are the electric field components, the typical values of χ^3 for traditional materials (for example the optical fibers used by Imoto et al. or Levenson et al. [9]), are around $10^{-22} - 10^{-20} m^2/V^2$ [16].

For QCAS media much larger χ^3 can be obtained up to $10^{-8} m^2/V^2$ [11,12], permitting large phase shifts with a short region of interaction between the probe and the signal field. This allows for the construction of a scheme where the probe field crosses both Kerr cells. The optical distance between them can be kept of the order of 10cm - 1m. A larger coherence length can be easily obtained, modulating it, for example, by inserting different Fabry-Perot interferometers. It has been reported in the literature [9] that a 1 cm long Na cell can provide a 10° phase-shift with a photon flux as low as 10^9 photons/s. This number can be relaxed considerably (by at least two orders of magnitude) to the region of photon counting techniques, which, in the visible part of the spectrum, can be considered the region below 10^7 photons/second, which is roughly the limit of today detectors and related electronics. Moreover, by substituting Na with Rb or Cs, different spectral regions can be covered and this can be useful when using, for example, a parametric fluorescence excited by an ultraviolet laser as the photon source (see below).

With respect to the above there seems to be a definite feasibility for implementing such an experiment, although it should be recognised that the practical problems are not simple to overcome and the existing technology would be operated towards its limits.

Next, we consider a possible extension of this experiment. Let us imagine that we receive the first photon as a member of a polarisation entangled state (the first photon is the input

in our interferometer, while the second will be photodetected at some other point D3, see fig.2); H and V indicate horizontal and vertical polarisations

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{|H\rangle|V\rangle + |V\rangle|H\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \quad (12)$$

as can be generated from a Type II down-conversion [17] or from a superposition of the parametric fluorescence produced in two Type I crystals [18] or from one single Type I crystal using a beam splitter [19].

Let us also use a polarising beam splitter to split the optical path on arm 2 and 3 (see fig.2): a photon with H polarisation will follow path 2 and a photon with V polarisation will follow path 3. When the pump laser crosses only the first Kerr cell, on arm 3, we obtain

$$|\Psi\rangle = \frac{|H\rangle|V\rangle|\nu'\rangle + |V\rangle|H\rangle|\nu\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \quad (13)$$

where $|\nu\rangle$ denotes the probe field left unaffected by the Kerr effect, while $|\nu'\rangle$ corresponds to the case where it has interacted with the signal photon in the Kerr medium. Incidentally, this state represents an interesting realisation of a Schrödinger cat: a "macroscopic" state (the coherent field) is entangled with the states of two microscopic systems (the two originally entangled photons). How quickly decoherence will destroy this entanglement is beyond the purposes of the present investigation.

If one considers the joint probability $P(\theta_1, \theta_2)$ where the photon is detected in D3, with a polariser at an angle θ_1 with respect to horizontal axis, in coincidence with the one in D1 or D2 (denoted with the index 2 in the following), with a polariser at an angle θ_2 respect to the horizontal axis, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} P(\theta_1, \theta_2) = \langle \Psi | a_3^\dagger a_2^\dagger a_2 a_3 | \Psi \rangle = 1/2 [\cos^2(\theta_1) \sin^2(\theta_2) + \cos^2(\theta_2) \sin^2(\theta_1) + \\ 2 \exp(-2|\nu|^2 \sin^2(\chi T)) \cos[|\nu|^2 \sin(2\chi T) + \varphi] \cos(\theta_1) \sin(\theta_2) \cos(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_1)] \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where φ takes into account other contributions to the phase differences aside from the one

due to interaction with signal field in the Kerr cell and where ideal detectors have been considered. Moreover, let in the following $P(\Theta)$ represent the single detection probability.

When no probe field is inserted, these correlation functions lead to a violation, for a proper choice of the polarizers, of the Bell (or Clauser-Horn) inequality, valid for local hidden variable theories. More in detail, for a maximal violation (selecting the proper angles for polarizers) one has a value $CHS = 0.207$ for the Clauser-Horn sum

$$CHS = P(\theta_1, \theta_2) - P(\theta_1, \theta'_2) + P(\theta'_1, \theta_2) + P(\theta'_1, \theta'_2) - P(\theta'_1) - P(\theta_2) \quad (15)$$

while one would expect a negative value for a local theory. When the Kerr effect modifies the phase of the probe field, this quantity is reduced and becomes ≤ 0 when the second term in eq. 14 is completely suppressed [for the sake of brevity, we do not discuss here efficiency loophole and the present state of Bell inequalities, see [17,18,20,21] and references therein]. Thus, one can test the violation of the Bell inequality without probe field, then when the probe is inserted in the Kerr cell on arm 3 of the interferometer, the violation of Bell inequality will be reduced proportionally to $\Phi = \exp(-2|\nu|^2 \sin^2(\chi T)) \cos[|\nu|^2 \sin(2\chi T) + \varphi]$, which is related to the signal-to-noise ratio in a homodyne measurement on the probe field $R = 4|\nu| \sin(\chi T)$. For example, the maximum of CHS is reduced to $CHS = 0.14$, 0.050 and $= 0.0025$ for $\Phi = 0.8$, 0.5 and 0.1 respectively.

The violation will be reduced (to the point where it disappears), when the set up works with the probe laser in both cells, but with a distance between the two cells larger than the probe coherence length. For the two paths, when the photon propagates through arm 2 (H polarisation) or 3 (V polarisation) respectively, remain distinguishable (see the former discussion).

Finally, when the coherence of the pump field is increased, as explained previously, the measurement of photon correlation functions will violate the Bell inequality again, because now the two paths will be indistinguishable and one will have a cancellation as in eq. 10.

This experiment will therefore permit to relate the violation of Bell inequality to obtaining or not the *welcher Weg* information. Of course, the effect on Bell inequalities is a direct consequence of the destruction of interference pattern, however, we think that this last example represents an interesting possibility to modulate decoherence on entangled state and to quantify this effect by a measurement of CHS.

In summary, we have suggested an experiment where quantum interference is modulated by the *welcher Weg* information obtained by a QND measurement achieved in a Kerr cell. In detail, *welcher Weg* information is obtained through the phase shift of a probe laser in two different Kerr cells on the two different arms of an interferometer. The probe crosses both the cells which have a relative distance larger than the probe coherence length. The erasure is obtained thus by increasing the probe coherence; for intermediate situations a partial restoration of interference will be obtained.

We have also considered some practical details for the realisation of this experiment, showing that it can be undertaken with available technology.

Finally, we have described how, using as the input in the former interferometer a photon belonging to an entangled state, we can relate Bell inequality violation to the *welcher weg* information erasure.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge support of ASI under contract LONO 500172.

We thank E. Predazzi for useful comments about the manuscript.

References

1. M.O. Scully and K. Drüll, Phys. Rev. A 25 (1982) 2208.
2. P.G. Kwiat et al, Phys. Rev. A 49 (1994) 61.
3. Z.Y. Ou et al., Phys. Rev. A 41 (1990) 566; X.Y. Zou et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 67 (1991) 318; P.G. Kwiat et al., Phys. Rev. A 45 (1992) 7729.
4. T.J. Herzog et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 75 (1995) 3034; Y.H. Shih and C.O. Alley, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61 (1988) 2921; J. Summhammer et al., Phys. Lett. A 90 (1982) 110.
5. S. Dürr et al., Nature 395 (1998) 33; M. O. Scully et al., Nature 351 (1991) 111.
6. B.C. Sanders and G.J. Milburn, Phys. Rev. A 39 (1989) 694.
7. B.-G. Englert, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77 (1996) 2154.
8. V.B. Braginsky and Y.I. Vorontsov, Sov. Phys. Uzp. 17 (1975) 644; W.G. Unruh, Phys. Rev. D 19 (1979) 2888; V.B. Braginsky et al., Science 209 (1980) 547; N. Imoto et al., Phys. Rev. A 32 (1985) 2287.
9. M.D. Levenson et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 57 (1986) 2473; N. Imoto et al., Opt. Comm. 61 (1987) 159; A. La Porta et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 62 (1989) 28; P. Grangier et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 66 (1991) 1418. For a review see: V. B. Braginsky and F.Y. Khalili, Rev. Mod. Phys. 68 (1996) 1.
10. Y.-H. Kim, S.P. Kulik, Y.H. Shih and M.O. Scully, quant-ph/9903047.
11. H. Schmidt and A. Imamoglu, Opt. Lett. 21 (1996) 1936.
12. U. Rathe et al., Phys. Rev. A 47 (1993) 4994.
13. L. Vestergaard Hau et al., Nature 397 (1999) 594.
14. E. Arimondo, in Progress in optics XXXV, E. Wolf editor, Elsevier Science 1996, pag. 257.

15. G.S. Agarwal, Opt. Comm. 72 (1989) 253.
16. see e.g. R. L. Sutherland, "Handbook of nonlinear optics", ed. M. Dekker 1996.
17. P.G. Kwiat Phys. Rev. A 49 (1994) 3209; P.G. Kwiat et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 4337, (1995); T.E. Kiess et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 3893, (1993).
18. L. Hardy, Phys. Lett. A 161, 326 (1992); M.Genovese, G. Brida, C. Novero and E. Predazzi, Proc. of ICSSUR 99, Napoli 1999, to be published.
19. Z.J. Ou and L. Mandel, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61, 50, (1988); Y.H.Shih et al., Phys. Rev. A, 1288, (1993);
20. J. P. Franson, P.R.L. 62, 2205 (1989); J. G. Rarity, and P. R. Tapster, P.R.L. 64, 2495 (1990); J. Brendel et al. E.P.L. 20, 275 (1992); P. G. Kwiat et al, P.R. A 41, 2910 (1990); W. Tittel et al, quant-ph 9806043. For a recent review see: A. Zeilinger, Rev. Mod. Phys. 71 (1999) S288.
21. E. Santos, Phys. Lett. A 212, 10 (1996).

Figure captions

fig.1) Scheme of the proposed experiment. The signal photon enters gate 1 of the beam splitter BS I. Two Kerr cells (K I and K II) are on the two arms of the interferometer. A probe laser crosses one or both the cells, according to the insertion or not of a mirror between the two Kerr cells. The signal beam is measured by the photo-detectors D1 and D2 at the out gates of the interferometer.

fig.2) Scheme for the use of an entangle state inside the interferometer. With respect to the scheme of fig.1, the photon entering the interferometer is produced in a non-linear crystal together with a second one detected in D3. The first beam splitter is substituted by a polarising beam splitter.